

The Republican.

No. 18. Vol. V.] LONDON, FRIDAY, March 3, 1822. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CITIZENS,

Dorchester Gaol, April 30,
Year 3, of the Spanish Revolution.

IN my last some observations were made as to the impossibility of union existing between a Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Established Church on the one hand, and a full Representation of the People as a House of Commons on the other. It was suggested that the elements of these bodies were hostile, or at least hostility would exist between the three former bodies, as a Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity, and the People, or their Representatives in a House of Commons. The inference of my suggestion was that a Legislature to exist for the welfare of the People as a whole must be vested in a House of Commons or Representatives over whom no power or check should exist, but in those who choose and appoint them to legislate. Checks from any other quarter would be as many acts of hostility towards the People, of which a clear proof is daily to be found in the conduct of the present parliament. Every attempt to reform is checked by the influence of the Crown and Aristocracy, and such would be the case if a complete House of Commons existed. There would be no harmony, no peace; all would be jealousy, confusion, and even blows. So clear is this case to my mind that in spite of all prejudice or expediency I will persevere in the doctrine, and stake all my pretensions and views as a political writer, on this one point, against all opposition; even if I stand alone for years to come. I am not aware that I am supported in this view of political reform by any one public writer in the country, but I have the satisfaction of seeing that none venture to shew me that I am wrong, and I can only view their silence as a sort of timid support, or an acknowledgment of my being correct without their open countenance. To tell us that this

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street.

is not the proper time to discuss the matter is the same species of evasion as the apostate advocates of Reform have ever applied to the question of putting it into practice. It is always the right time to be honest, and no time so well for that purpose as the time present. But I say *most positively* that when we see progressive revolutions in governments surrounding us, and when we are hourly expecting the same thing at home, it is the most proper time to discuss the propriety of the form or system of the future; and the thing can be better done now than when a sort of civil war rages in the country which the breaking up of the present system would inevitably occasion in some degree.

The motion made last week in the House of Commons for a moderate or progressive reform was resisted in the same manner as it would have been if the motion had been for the abolition of the Monarchy, House of Lords, and Established Church. George Canning insists that the People do not want a Reform. He looks at himself and those who live by his means as the People. On the other side it is insisted that the People do want a Reform; but then this is a different People and both are right. There are two sorts of People in this country; the idle and the industrious; the tax-eaters and tax-payers: the former say, "*We like things best as they are,*" and the latter say, "*We must and will have a change,*" and the result will be a trial of physical superiority. That "*Reform will be obtained when the existing authorities have no longer the power to withhold it and not before,*" is an assertion I am not afraid to repeat, although it has been called seditious, and although Mr. Ridgway and others are suffering imprisonment for publishing it. I do not think that Reform will ever be voted in any shape by the Legislature in its present state, neither do I deem it necessary or desirable, for I am certain this Legislature would not vote it effectual, it would leave just as much to be done by the People as they have now to do, and the means adequate to the one will be efficient for the other.

As taxation has now nearly annihilated the whole rental of the land or landed property, it is difficult to say how far the present Legislature will pursue its revolutionary career, or what changes it may adopt. That it is proceeding blindfold is evident even to those who wish to support it; but move which way it will, it must move towards its own declension, and the growing power of its opponent, the industrious part of the community. It has no moral support. I really doubt whether there be a cheerful tax-payer in the

country who takes nothing back from the same source. This, then, is not what is called a civil government: it is a despotism: the tax-payer pays as far as possible, not willingly, but to avoid a greater evil, to avoid a confiscation of what he possesses or wishes to possess, in just the same manner as under the Turkish Government, where an individual who has accumulated some property, freely gives up a portion to an Aga with the hope of concealing the rest.

Painful as is the distress occasioned by excessive taxation, it affords some solace to reflect that the friends as well as the enemies of the present system begin to feel its pressure in reality. Those Janizaries, called the Yeomanry Cavalry, are now more likely to revolt and decapitate their Agas and their Sultan, than to keep down Reformers. They have now something to think about besides the Radicals. That they have been kept up to keep down Reform is now well understood. When the savages at Manchester were hacking and hewing the thronged and resistless multitude, the common cry was, "WE'LL CUT DOWN REFORM, DOWN WITH REFORM AND REFORMERS." In many of their drunken bouts, in different parts of the country, these fellows have expressed a wish that they had some Radicals to engage, or to murder would express their meaning better. They have been taught that their enemies were the advocates of Reform; and the brutes knew no better until distress came upon them to teach them better. A Radical, a Jacobin, and a Frenchman or Spaniard, were the same creatures in their ideas, and were unnaturally viewed as their natural enemies. Distress has become their enlightener, and their old masters may begin to tremble at the revenge and enraged feelings of those whom they have deceived, and to feel the consequences of their training an army of dupes without being able to protect them from the common misery and calamity of their own measures.

The Legislature has proclaimed that its omnipotence is at an end; that it cannot relieve the agriculturist, and that a revolution must result from its past measures. This is the sum and substance of all the debates in Parliament about the agricultural distress. We shall see the session of Parliament broken up much earlier than usual just to prevent its continuing the focus of clamour and complaint. Nothing will be done: nothing can it do but proclaim its past follies and corruptions.

A standing army well clothed and well fed is become the cry of the Government, and as long as this can be kept up,

all attempt to reform will be kept down. When this army is provided for the session of Parliament will close, and it will meet again next year for that purpose and no other. It is the last hold the Government has on the People, and that People will be stripped to the skin and even to the bones to support it, if they are disposed to sit quietly down under the attempt.

Republicans, the very Whig papers are beginning to acknowledge the increase of your numbers, and the probability that the whole People will be driven to avow themselves with us the advocates of a complete Representative System of Government. This will be the end of the present struggle for Reform, I am certain; therefore, I aspire with you to be among the first to proclaim its superiority to all other systems. We shall certainly have the satisfaction to say that we were among the first to advocate that system of government which can alone establish permanent freedom, and that which shall as certainly obtain a decided preference when a time for choice shall arrive.

R. CARLILE.

TO THE CHRISTIAN JUDGE BAILEY.

LETTER VIII.

MY last was a comment proper on that farrago of nonsense, lies, and detestable composition of words called the Apostles' Creed, or commonly, the Creed or Belief. It is one of those stupifying things with which the minds of the children of Christians are imbued even in infancy, and, in conjunction with the stuff called the Lord's Prayer, forms a standard to put up as an orison on all occasions, in addition to a permanent morning and evening dose.

In a note, you tell us that it was not written by the Apostles; this we know: but if you had lived three hundred years since, and had written the same thing, you would have gone to the stake as a heretic and blasphemer: you would have been a martyr instead of what you now are—a persecutor. It was called the Apostles' Creed, because, like many other legends, it was falsely alledged to have been written by the apostles, and received as such by those

worst of all savages, the Christian multitude, and by most of their equally cruel, and equally ignorant priests.

I now pass over several paltry prayers in which there is nothing particular, save that the Christian God is described as a fighting God; such as, "Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou O God," and similar expressions; and come to the Creed called the Athanasian Creed. One of the prayers which I pass, entitled a prayer for the King's Majesty, states that the Christian God, or Jehovah, is the "only ruler of princes," thus saying that all princes have absolute power. This is the Christian maxim we know, but the majesty of the people is fast rising above that of Jehovah and all princes. Look at Spain and Portugal, if you wish to see who are the rulers of princes. You will soon find a power arise that will laugh at and despise both your princes and ruler of princes. The time is coming when an intelligent people shall dispense with both. If you and me do not witness this change completed, another generation will. There will then be no occasion to pray for peace or grace, or any thing else: a wise legislature, the express image of a whole people, shall provide both for their wants and their protection, by a proper application of their minds and their hands, and the produce of national industry.

The creed of St. Athanasius is another document which is now acknowledged not to have been written by the person whose name it bears, although it is a perfect resemblance of the life and conduct of the turbulent and despotic Athanasius. It might be expected that I should find much to say or much to ridicule over this creed, but I really can scarcely persuade myself to pass a comment upon it. Its denunciations are so damnable, its contradictions so gross, that it may be fairly viewed as an epitome of the Christian Religion, and as a focus in which all the rancour of Christianity and Christians is concentrated. It is worse than any thing that can be found in the Jew Books, as a prostitution of language. It is a disgrace to our age and our country, and the man who can support it as far as you have supported it, is much more fit for a human butcher, or a general butcher of all kinds of animals, than to preside over the lives and liberties of his fellow countrymen as a judge of law. If there be a man living who really holds this creed as right and necessary, he must be a cold-blooded brute, an inhuman monster: he must be a Christian indeed: and as Christians renounce both Reason and her parent Nature,

they must of course be unnatural inhuman beings; religious monsters they have proved themselves in all ages. However, there is no kind of Christian who could escape the damnation threatened by this creed: it embraces all mankind, for no man can really believe that which he cannot comprehend. Belief and comprehension are synonymous terms: disbelief, so far from being sinful or immoral, towards any creed or dogmas, is the very essence of virtue and morality, where it be avowed; as it guarantees the absence of hypocrisy; it is synonymous with incomprehension.

In the preposterous creed before us, the whole of which we are told we must believe or be exposed to everlasting fire, we are called upon to believe the existence of three Gods as one God, and one God as three Gods; and further, that we must believe them to be uncreate, eternal, almighty, and incomprehensible. This is a solecism, a gross perversion of language. I should like no better amusement than an hour's conversation with you upon this subject, Mr. Justice Bailey. If I could not put a blush upon your grave and hypocritical face, I would consent to receive another three years imprisonment under those very Christian despots who have so studiously sought to destroy my health, and the healths of those who are confined with me. If I did not destroy your Christian faith or silence you within one hour, by pursuing a string of interrogations arising out of this creed; I will promise never to say a word against you or the Christian Religion hereafter.

The persons who fabricated, and the persons who support this creed, must certainly consider it an attempt to try the point how far the human mind could be imposed upon, and what outrageous notions it could entertain. This creed is a true epitome of Christianity, or such as it came out refined from the turbulent councils of the early fathers, as they are called. When we are told that the Son, which means Jesus Christ, is *not made nor created, but begotten*, may we not wonder how any thing short of insanity can subscribe to such words. To beget is to create or to make, the words are exactly of the same meaning. The two words *Father and Son* imply seniority and emanation, yet we are told the Son is eternal with the Father, and co-equal. Further, the Son is represented as holding the human figure, and human flesh, and deifying the manhood; if so, the Father and the Holy Ghost must be the same, according to this preposterous collection of words. So here at once we are told, what all mythologists have held, that Gods and men are animals

of the same form, and composed of the same matter, and this nonsense is propagated as an argument for the resurrection of the same flesh after death! "Perfect God and perfect man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting," is the Christian description of the Christian God! Oh! Nature! and am I imprisoned and robbed by Christians for opposing such brutish stuff as this? Am I called a blasphemer for saying the Deity is not composed of human flesh? I am so called, and the case is strictly analogous to the case of the thief, who, whilst running to save himself and his plunder, cries to all enquirers, "*stop the thief whom I am pursuing*," and thus turns their attention from the real thief. My persecutors are the real blasphemers, and you, Mr. Justice Bailey, are one of them, but to save the plunder which your system of blasphemy procures, you endeavour to divert public attention by setting up a hue and cry of blasphemy against me. I can prove to demonstration that you are a blasphemer of the Deity, and I challenge you to prove any thing of the kind against me: in fact, in passing sentence upon me you acknowledged that mine was not a blasphemy against God, but a blasphemy against my fellow countrymen in attempting to deprive them of their religion. That religion is founded on blasphemy towards the God of Nature; which I will fully explain when I come into the Court of King's Bench again, in spite of all the attempts of you and your brother judges to silence me. I shall come well schooled and prepared for you, which was not the case before. I shall face you in all the boldness of honesty, and with all the dignity of a persecuted man, innocent of the charges upon which he has been robbed and imprisoned. I will look upon you without shame or without a blush, and feel a pride in being the opponent of the hypocrisy, falsehood, and blasphemy which you labour hard to propagate.

I quit the Athanasian Creed, not that I have written all that I could say against it, for there is not a sentence but is a gross lie, or blasphemy, or vagary. It really is too contemptible for the comment of any person who professes a love of truth. To denounce it, as full of lies and blasphemy, is all that is necessary, and all that I can conceive to be required from me. In the first place you acknowledge that it was not written by Athanasius, and it is now more generally understood to have been written by a monk of the name of Vigilius, a century after the time of Athanasius. It forms another proof of the common inauthenticity of all the Chris-

tian legends, and the common practice of putting them under the sanction of some high-sounding name as the best means of imposing upon the credulity of the ignorant multitude.

I shall for the present digress from the subject of the Book of Common Prayer to exhibit a specimen of your infamous persecuting conduct towards another person.

By the time this letter gets into circulation from the press, Robert Wedderburn, who is also confined in this gaol for an alleged charge of blasphemy, will have completed his period of two years imprisonment, and will I hope be able to return to London with a better conscience than you his judge and his persecutor can ever feel. A record of this man's case is worth preserving, as, if your life be spared a few years, it may form an item, and a heavy one too, in your bill of impeachment.

In the year 1819, Robert Wedderburn was in the habit of delivering discourses in a place called Hopkins' Street Chapel, and such was the degree of interest excited, that, I have been informed his chapel was always crowded whenever he thought proper to open it. I was never present at any of his discourses, but I have heard those say on whose judgments I could rely, that although, he was evidently what is called an uneducated or unlettered man, still he possessed great natural ability, which, combined with a powerful and striking eccentricity of manner, was calculated not only to engage the attention but the admiration of many of his friends and hearers. To these acquirements it was well known that he added invariably a boldness and honesty of sentiment, and a probity of manners calculated on all occasions to counteract the defects of judgment, or the want of a few superficial accomplishments.

After my mock trials had passed in the Court of King's Bench, the subject was discussed in Mr. Wedderburn's chapel: "Whether Judge Abbott had refused my examination of the Bible from a motive of piety, or a consciousness that it was a book that could not bear that examination." These, if not the words, were the substance of the question for discussion. During this discussion, I understand, Mr. Wedderburn alluded to the contradiction of the Jew Books about the visibility of the Deity. The New Testament says, that, "No man hath seen God at any time," and Mr. Wedderburn sagaciously observed, that, if this were true "what a liar Moses must be who was always meeting God, in every bush, face to face." These with some words about

Jesus Christ, that I do not now recollect, as I write altogether from memory, formed the subject of an information by the Attorney General, when the Grand Jury at a Middlesex Session had thrown out a bill of indictment for the same thing or something very similar before.

At the time of trial, Mr. Wedderburn put in a very able written defence, arguing the propriety of a free discussion; a defence which the Chief Justice complimented for its stile, its force, and its ability; and the Jury, although they returned a verdict of guilty, particularly recommended him to mercy, on the ground that he having been born in Jamaica, had not been educated in the Christian Religion. At the time of receiving sentence he put in another very able paper, but prefaced it with some oral observations on the Bible, which called forth your animadversion, and persecuting-bigot like you, sentenced him to two years imprisonment in this gaol, although he had previously suffered some months confinement in Newgate for want of bail, and this in the face of the Jury's particular recommendation to mercy!

His treatment in this Gaol has been no less wanton and cruel than your sentence. On his arrival he was kept for some months over what is called the lodge, where prisoners are first put before they are examined by the gaol surgeon, to see whether they are clean and free from all diseases; and immediately on being so examined they are removed into their respective wards. This was not the treatment for Mr. Wedderburn, he was locked up in this very confined place for near three months, and then removed to a situation very little better, that is, into the ward of solitude, where he has been treated exactly as prisoners are treated who are sentenced to solitary confinement, throughout his two years. His residence has been a small cell, which has a small fire-place, in which he might put fire if he could purchase fuel, and not otherwise. In the day time his cell door was opened, and he had the range of a passage that may be twenty feet long or better, but from this passage he could see nothing nor no person, but accidental passers up the stair-case, and at the best of times, this passage must have been gloomy, at others very cold from a strong current of air. No prisoner was allowed to go near him to converse, and one hour each day only was he allowed to walk out in company with a sentinel, which I presume has been neglected as often as practised. Wedderburn's treatment has been altogether worse than mine, and the looking at his case has made me in some measure think lighter of my own, for

within the walls of a room I have had every thing that is desirable but society, and since Mrs. Carlile and the infant came I have had that, and if we had free access to the open air in the day time no complaint should we have remaining, but the lack of this makes our confinement unwholesome and unhealthy, and the capricious exclusion of friends makes it further painful. Still when I consider that Wedderburn has been two years without the sight of a friend, or the conversation of any one whom he knew before, shut up in solitary confinement, and denied even the solace or amusement that I as a fellow prisoner could and was anxious to have furnished him, in the loan of books and many other trifles, when I consider this, my own case has always appeared to me comparatively light and scarcely worth a murmur.

How far Mr. Wedderburn may have suffered in health I cannot say, he does not appear to me to be as robust as three years ago in London, but I feel assured that if he does not take particular care of himself he will feel serious effects arising from his confinement, on entering into his former condition in life. Gilbert Wakefield survived his confinement in this gaol but a short time, although he was here at a time when there were indulgences very different to what are now to be obtained, and when the residence of the mother of the present keeper in the prison formed a guarantee for humanity: for what the old lady could not do openly for the prisoners she would do secretly. The case is now very different, the present keeper is a mere insensate machine in the hands of the magistrates, and if he pleases them he appears to consider that he has no other duties to perform. His horse or his cow engages his humanity as much as his prisoners, and obtain just as much consideration. Of the general management of the prison I do not complain, but the case of Wedderburn has been abominable, comparing his treatment with the common treatment of other prisoners. Instead of being treated with a leniency suitable to his alleged misdemeanor, he has been treated with a marked severity. Perhaps Mr. Wedderburn does not know that the canting Wilberforce has visited and conversed with him in his cell, about a year and a half since, and subsequently pronounced him a honest conscientious man! Did he think Wedderburn had fair play I should like to know?

Now Mr. Justice Bailey, Wedderburn's imprisonment is expired; and I would ask you to reflect seriously on his case, and consider whether the words he spoke deserved any

such a tremendous punishment, or any punishment at all. The sum and substance of his words were that there were contradictions in the Bible. This was a moral truth; no honest man can deny it. Admitting that his sense of the matter was not expressed in the most refined manner, this alters not the case; his language, or his stile of expression, was suited to the minds of his company or his audience, there was a familiarity existing between them, which justified the stile of expression: what the one expressed the others felt, and this entirely annihilates the idea that a truth expressed in coarse language is an offence against the public morals. Wedderburn, I insist, did nothing in opposition to public morals. His language was not calculated to injure any one; what then was the spirit that persecuted him? The spirit of bigotry, of tyranny, of revenge, for an exposed folly, falsehood, and inconsistency. The conduct of Wedderburn was strictly moral, your conduct in persecuting him was immoral in the extreme, the punishment to which you have subjected him is inhuman on your part, and on the part of those who have participated in it. It was not called for, it was not necessary to any honest purpose whatever, it was not legal, and should I perceive it to have destroyed his health or to hasten his death, I should not hesitate a moment to charge you with participating in his murder.

If a man for a trifling misdemeanor be exposed to a long and severe imprisonment, if his treatment be such as to undermine his health and hasten his dissolution, even if he survives his imprisonment, that man is a murdered man; a man murdered by the worst and most painful means, and all who participate in his sentence, and his treatment under that sentence, are his murderers, and assassins of the very worst species. He who strikes with the dagger, or causes death by any sudden blow, is not half so great a monster as he who produces death by a slow and painful process, or such as that of improper treatment under a long or even a short imprisonment.

Prisons, I may be told, are not intended to be places of comfort; I grant they ought not to be, if none but those who deserve imprisonment are confined in them. A prison, I assert, ought to be a place of frugal living and hard labour, but then none ought to be confined but those who have robbed another, or inflicted bodily injury on another; and then a compensation should be made by a proportionate degree of labour, and not by a length of confinement. There should be no punishment but hard labour; the pro-

duce of which should be applied to compensate the injury done by the prisoner, where property could compensate. Connected with such a system, every thing calculated to preserve or improve the health and the morals of the prisoner should be strictly observed; otherwise, those who have him in custody become greater criminals to society than the thief himself. The present system of gaol discipline is nothing but a system of revenge, torture, and mental degradation; there is no moralizing, no improvement, no compensation to individuals who prosecute for injury done them. It would be better to be without gaols altogether, and to put in force what is called village justice or summary punishment to offenders, than support them in their present state. The laws of this country are laws that would increase the savageness of savages: they are revengeful, they are blood-thirsty, inimical to the propagation of morality, and a bar to all moral and mental improvement. Talk of civilization and humanity indeed! Neither of it exists in this country yet. Human misery still preponderates here, and none increase it more than such false moralists, such hypocrites, and men with minds so idolatrous, so superstitious as Mr. Justice Bailey's. When human misery loses the balance we will begin to talk of humanity and civilization; until then the future historian will rank us with the savage ages and nations, and justly so: there will then be no distinction made between a Bailey and a Jefferies.

R. CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, April 28, 1822,
of the Christian Idolatry.

THE FOLLOWING EXTRACTS

Are translated from "LE BON SEUS," the Work of a French Priest; the whole of which will be shortly translated and printed in this country under the title of "GOOD SENSE, OR NATURAL OPPOSED TO SUPERNATURAL IDEAS."

"WHEN the opinions of men are coolly and dispassionately examined, nothing is more rare than to see them make use of good sense, even in those things which they regard as of the highest importance and most essential value. Good sense is that portion of judgment which is sufficient for the

discovery of simple truths and useful knowledge; it teaches us to reject striking absurdities and palpable contradiction. Yet how surprizing is it, that in theology we have an example of its total absence, for though it is a science that has been revered in all times, and in all countries, and though it is regarded by them as the most important, the most useful, and the most indispensable object to the happiness of society, still, very few give themselves the trouble to examine the principles on which this science pretends to establish itself. If they did this, they would be obliged to acknowledge that these principles, which are considered as incontestible, are only hazardous suppositions invented by ignorance, propagated by enthusiasm or bad faith, adopted by timid credulity, preserved by custom, which has never reasoned upon them, and revered solely because they are imaginary and incomprehensible.

“Of all the different ideas given to us of the will of a Supreme Being, of a God who is called the Creator and Preserver of Man, there are none more revolting than those of that wily impostor, Moses.

“The principles of all religion are founded on the ideas of a God: but it is impossible for men to have true ideas of a being that acts on none of their senses. All principle is judgment, all judgment is the effect of experience; experience is acquired by the exercise of the senses: hence it evidently follows, that religious principles are founded on nothing, and are not innate.

“All our ideas are the representations of objects which strike us; what then can represent to us the idea of *God*, which is evidently an idea without object? Is not such an idea as impossible as an effect without a cause? Is an idea without prototype any thing else than a chimera? Yet some Doctors assure us, that the idea of *God* is *innate*, or that men have these ideas from their mothers' wombs.

“If God is an infinite being, there can be no relation between man and his God, either in the actual world or in a world to come.

“Ignorance and fear are the two pivots on which all religions turn. The fears of men become habitual to them, and change according to their wants, till, at length, they are led to believe they want something, if they have nothing to terrify them. When the mind is under the influence of superstition, it will have fear, the imagination demands it, and seems to fear nothing so much as to have nothing to fear.

" If religion was clear, it would be much less attractive to the vulgar and ignorant. There must be obscurity, mysteries, terrors, fables, prodigies, and incredible things, perpetually, to unsettle their brains. Romances, idle stories, the recitals of dreams and sorceries have more charms for vulgar minds than true history.

" The origin of religious opinions may generally be dated from those times when savage nations were yet in a state of infancy."

A CRITICAL ENQUIRY INTO THE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS.

(Continued from p. 528.)

But here, as in other cases, he did not mean what he said, his ideas were so sublime, he could not express them ! But his disciples can tell us the meaning. No doubt there are a set of men who live upon the industry of others, to them it is applicable; they do not need to care for to-morrow, they are the lilies of the valley; they toil not, neither do they spin: yet see how well they live. They may follow this advice, but the whole of mankind cannot.

According to Matthew, (ch. vi. ver. 9—13.) it was when he delivered this famous Sermon that he gave that form of prayer which is called the Lord's Prayer by way of eminence: but according to Luke, (ch. xi. ver. 1.) this form of prayer must have been given at a later period of his life, and certainly on a different occasion, for he tells us that he had been praying apparently alone, and when he came, one of his disciples said unto him, " Lord, teach us how to pray," when he gave them that precious specimen as a form or pattern. But the words of this Prayer are not the same in both. Luke entirely omits the conclusion. Mark and John, I suppose, never heard of either it or the Sermon, as they have not thought it worth repeating, nor the Sermon worth the smallest notice. This is very strange, to omit even the Lord's Prayer, and, at the same time, to relate so many other trifles!

Matthew tells us, (ch. viii. ver. 2.) when he had finished his Sermon and was come down from the mount, a leper came to him desiring to be cleansed, which was done: but Mark (ch. i. ver. 40.) says, this was done when he was in Galilee, preaching in their synagogues. Luke says, it was in a certain city, we know not where; and John passes it over without notice.

Matthew tells us also (ch. viii. ver. 5.) of a centurion who came to Jesus beseeching him to come and heal his servant: but Luke says, (ch. vii. ver. 7.) that the centurion did not come, because he did not think himself worthy, but sent (ver. 3.) the elders of the Jews, and when Jesus was come near he sent his friends. Now, Matthew says he went himself; and Luke says he did not, but sent. Which of these accounts is true? Mark and John have not thought the story worth telling, or else we should probably have had something different from both.

No kind of miracles make so great a figure among the actions of Jesus as casting out devils; in reading the Evangelists we might suppose that one-half of the inhabitants were diseased or possessed with them. Possession with the devil is a trouble unknown in any former age of the world, except in the case of Saul, who had one sent from God; and it is equally unknown in any other age or country, since it is peculiar to God's own people alone. This imaginary possession must have originated entirely in the ignorance and superstition of these authors, in ascribing every unknown disease to the power of the devil, and in their earnest wish to shew the power of their hero over him. In all the accounts that we have of the Deity or Gods, from whatever nation, it appears indispensable, in order to shew his or their power, to create some opposite power to vanquish, that they may display his power the better. The case has been the same with these writers, it would seem, by their account that at this time the Deity and the Devil were striving which to get possession of the earth.

But these marvellous diseases, these possessions with the Devil, even admitting the relation to be true, and that the diseases were such as they are described, after cool examination, cease to appear in any respect supernatural; they appear to have been cases of epilepsy, or falling sickness and insanity, diseases which are to be found everywhere, and for which an unbeliever might say, the Deity was more to blame than the Devil. These diseases are not wonderful in themselves, but the history of them is very suspicious on account of their number, and certainly very incredible in relating the method of cure: but when the Pharisees said that Jesus cast out Devils through Belzebub, the Prince of Devils, he asked them by what power their children cast them out—this proves it was a common operation with them. What are we to think of this?

The account of the legion of Devils dispossessed and sent into the herd of swine is, like most of their stories, very beautifully varied in the relation. Matthew tell us, that it was in the country of the Gergesenes: Mark and Luke both say it was in the country of the Gadarenes. Matthew says, there were two men who met him possessed with Devils: but according to Mark and Luke, there was only one. Mark says, no man could bind him, no not with chains: but Luke tells us he was *kept bound* in chains, but he had broken them. Mark says, the Devils besought Jesus not to send them out of the

country, (they had liked the Jews for neighbours) : Luke says, they besought Jesus that he would not command them to go into the deep? Were they afraid of being drowned? Or does the deep mean Hell? Where is Hell, is it beneath? We are told, when the Devils were cast out they entered (at Christ's command) into a herd of about 2000 swine that were feeding near, and the whole herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea and were drowned. This was strange! But John passes over the whole story in silent contempt.

There are several questions naturally arising out of this story.

1. How was such a number of swine as 2000 kept in one herd in a country where swine were declared unclean, in their law, and were held in abomination by the people?

2. Has the story been fabricated by the authors to excite a prejudice against *swine*?

3. Was it justice, if true, to drown the people's swine?

4. Could Jesus not cast out the Devils without destroying people's property, and perhaps ruining them?

Although Christians pretend to admire this transaction at this distance of time and place, yet, were any person in this country to cause so many of his neighbour's swine to be drowned, he would probably be sent after them himself, and many would think he deserved it: but the Saints in the New Testament had the privilege of working mischief with impunity as well as the Worthies in the Old. A Deist might say, that Jesus Christ appears to sanction that by word as well as example; he says, that the Priests in the Temple profane the Sabbath-day, and are blameless, and refers to the law of Moses for proof of what he says, triumphantly asking the scribes and Pharisees (ch. xii. ver. 5.) if they had not read it, although there is not such a passage in all the law of Moses!

On another occasion they brought to him many that were possessed with Devils, and he cast them out, and healed all who were sick, (this he did) that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias, saying, "Himself took our infirmities and bore our sicknesses." Now, what are we to make of this, there is no such passage in all the book of Isaiah? The passage to which he referred is perhaps ch. liii. ver. 4. "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted." Who the person is we are not told, but this is spoken of what is past, and not of Jesus Christ at all; even the words are not the same, nor is the sense given.

Matthew (ch. viii. ver. 20.) and Luke (ch. ix. ver. 53.) tell us of a man who wished to follow Jesus wherever he went, but Jesus told him that the foxes had holes and the birds of the air had nests, but he had nowhere to lay his head: now, John (ch. i. ver. 39.) says, that he had a house, and the disciples went and saw where he dwelt, and Matthew tells us that he dwelt at Capernaum. Is this a contradiction, or had he been turned out of both houses? We need not wonder if he was, considering his strolling habits.

About this time (Matt. ch. x. ver. 1.) Jesus sent forth his twelve Apostles to teach the people, and to preach concerning him; and before sending them out we have a muster of them, a list of their names given. Now, in the simple business of a list of their names we might have expected agreement, but no, we are not told correctly what were the names of all the twelve Apostles. Matthew and Mark have in their list one named Thaddeus: while Luke has not one of that name in his. Luke, again, has in his list Judas, the brother of James, a name which is not to be found in any of the others. These two differ so much, that we do not know what were their names, or who they were. This is strange, that they cannot agree on the names of the twelve Apostles, names which ought to have been correctly known to all.

Matthew gives us a copy of the instructions which Jesus gave them before he sent them out: these instructions are almost wholly omitted by the other Evangelists; indeed, few of them deserve to be recorded. An unbeliever might say, that several of them deserve the severest censure for their intolerance and partiality.

If he was really come on earth for the salvation of mankind, why did he command his disciples, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not?" Now, how could they believe on him if they did not hear of him, if men are to be damned for not believing on him? The Deist may ask, Was there any humanity in this order? But he says, "Go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Was not this partiality? Was the Israelite more or less deserving than the Gentiles or Samaritans? And why did he strictly charge his disciples afterwards to tell no man of him that he was the Christ? (See Matt. ch. xvi. ver. 20. Mark ch. viii. ver. 36. Luke ch. ix. ver. 21.)

His order to them to provide nothing for their journey, was improvident, and a proof that he meant his followers to live upon the industry of other men, an order which they have not failed to follow in succeeding ages.

The unbeliever might object, the threat that it should be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for those who did not receive or hear his disciples, is a proof of a very tolerant spirit, indeed! We are informed in Genesis what was the punishment inflicted on Sodom and Gomorrah, fire and brimstone from Heaven; so he meant worse for them who would not hear his disciples. Does this prove that he only wanted power, or else would he have been as cruel a persecutor as other religious enthusiasts? The professors of his religion have been largely endowed with the same charitable spirit, indeed, Christianity has been apparently the most intolerant and bloody of all religions, not only against those who did not believe it at all, but also the different sects against one another, it partakes largely of its Jewish origin.

And what are we to think of his prophecy, or promises, (ver. 23.) "Verily ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the son of man be come." Did he mean his second coming, which has been

so long expected? He could not mean his first coming, as he was with them at the time, and if he meant his second coming, what are we to think of him as a prophet? Has it happened according to his prediction?

And what are we to think of a man, the founder of a religion, who declares that he came not to send peace on earth, but a sword? To set the father against the son, and the son against the father, the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; in short, to make all the members of the family enemies to one another! Can we suppose any calamity or mischief greater than a sword without, and a man's family all enemies to one another within? However, we should hold our peace, and remember, that the peace of God passeth all understanding. But does the man deserve to be venerated, deified, or worshipped, who was the cause of it? Is this the humble, meek, and lowly Jesus? In this he resembles Moses considerably. Does Mahomet promise such blessings to the world? Or does he threaten worse punishment to his enemies?

He declares also, (Luke ch. x. ver. 21.) that except a man hate his father and his mother, brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be his disciple! What ought we to think of the founder of a religion who made such a declaration? What ought we to think of a band of disciples filled with such sublime virtues as this? This is Christian virtue and benevolence, indeed! We shall, no doubt, be told that here also he did not mean what he said, but why did he not speak common sense, and tell his own meaning plainly himself? Why did he not enlighten men's minds and make them to understand the truth at once? However, this was hardly to be expected when he returns thanks to his father, (ch. xi. ver. 25.) that he had hid these things from the wise and prudent, and had revealed them unto babes! A sceptic might object, why were they hidden from any if they were for the benefit of mankind? Wise and prudent men were most likely to be correct judges of wise doctrines, and more likely to communicate or teach them to the rest of mankind than babes or fools: but probably wise and prudent men would have seen too much folly and absurdity about them to have rejected them, and babes and fools only could receive them!

(To be continued.)

TO MR. R. CARLILE.

SIR,

PERHAPS you will not deem me intrusive if I attempt to point out to you a few errors which have been committed in the getting up of the report of the proceedings of the Meeting held in Leeds on the 10th (and not on the 17th, as stated in "The Republican,") of last December, for the purpose of addressing Sir Charles Wolseley, Bart.

In the first place, I think some reasons ought to have been assigned why the proceedings were now published in "The Republican," above four months after the Meeting was held. With those reasons you no doubt are acquainted.

And, secondly, it ought to have been observed, that after Mr. Watson, who seconded the amended Address, had done speaking, Mr. Mason, the proposer of the original Address, immediately rose to controvert the arguments used by Mr. Brayshaw, and in his speech took occasion to hold forth Mr. Brayshaw as a visionary, and as the advocate of visionary schemes of Government. Mr. Brayshaw then rose to reply, and fully proved that a pure Representative Government and an Elective Magistracy was the only system of Government under which a people could enjoy real Liberty—be contented and happy. Wm. Braithwaite followed on the same side, and from the above will be seen the propriety of my allusions to Mr. Brayshaw.

And, thirdly, it ought to have been observed, that the amended Address was carried.

And now, Sir, in conclusion, I beg leave to say, that you and I totally differ on religious subjects, yet I admire your political principles, believing you to be an honest, sincere man, a man who has the good of your fellow-creatures at heart, and, as such, deserving far more support than you have hitherto received. I profess myself a Christian, yet, if I had it in my power, I would remove the huge mountain of Prejudice which a set of *hypocritical money-loving* PRIESTS and ignorant fanatics have excited against you, and pay the unjust and exorbitant fines which the (I don't know what to call them) Judges have imposed upon you and your Sister. Christianity wants not the support of such wretched men. I now conclude, wishing you, your Wife, Sister, and Family, and all who have volunteered their service in your support, all possible happiness and comfort, and may we soon obtain of your exertions the RIGHT OF FREE DISCUSSION ON ALL SUBJECTS.

Yours truly,

Leeds, April 22, 1822.

W. BRAITHWAITE.

A sad mistake has occurred in setting up the Report of the Leeds' Meetings; a connecting comment was sent with the Reports, which the Printer has overlooked and omitted. The second speech of Mr. Mason was not sent, nor was it published in any other document. If Mr. Mason wishes it added, and will send it, it shall be inserted as an appendix. It is too late to mend the matter now, but a full explanation shall be made when the whole of the documents have appeared.

EDITOR.

PETITION OF MARY ANN CARLILE TO THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS, AND CORRESPOND-
ENCE WITH MR. HOBHOUSE ON THE SUB-
JECT.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF GREAT
BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEM-
BLED.

The Petition of MARY ANN CARLILE, late of London, Book-
seller, now a Prisoner in his Majesty's Gaol of Dorchester.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

THAT your Petitioner comes before your Honourable House with a complaint of an undue administration of the laws towards her, on the part of the Judges of his Majesty's Court of King's Bench, and on the part of Sir William Draper Best, Knt., one of the Judges of that Court, in particular.

That on the 24th day of July, 1821, your Petitioner appeared in the Court of King's Bench to defend herself against an indictment instituted by a secret association of prosecutors, calling themselves a Society for the Suppression of Vice; but who, in fact, are a set of intolerant, bigoted persecutors, aiming chiefly at the suppression of virtue, or the truths that would inevitably arise from a free discussion of matters of theology and philosophy; in which indictment a selection from a pamphlet, entitled "An Appendix to the Theological Works of Thomas Paine," was charged as a blasphemous libel; and that in the course of her defence she had occasion to state that the Common Law, on which it was pretended that her indictment was founded, was a common abuse, and although the written defence with which she was prepared to defend herself fully bore out the assertion, and gave a complete explanation of the term used, the Judge (Sir William Draper Best) stopped her defence altogether, and would not allow her to offer another sentence, nor even the completion of that in the midst of which she was stopped, unless she would retract the assertion that the Common Law was a common abuse, and promise not to repeat it. Your Petitioner not feeling disposed to acquiesce in this arbitrary, unjust, illegal, and despotic command, was altogether prevented from making her defence, and the aforesaid Judge called upon the Jury

for their verdict, stating positively that the charge of the indictment was proper, and that the selection from the pamphlet in question was a blasphemous libel; upon which unfair assertion a verdict of Guilty was returned without any trial taking place, or without any defence being heard: whilst your Petitioner verily believes, that if she had received a fair hearing, she would have been acquitted of the charge on that indictment, as she was on a subsequent one on the same day, where she trusted her defence to a Counsel, whom the Judge repeatedly tried, in vain, to silence.

That, in the Michaelmas Term last, she employed Counsel to move for a new trial before a full Court, when Mr. Justice Best swayed the Court by a statement utterly false, that in the course of reading he had repeatedly complained of your Petitioner's defence before he stopped it altogether, when, in fact, not the least interruption occurred, nor was any objection made to a sentence, or even a word, until the afore-mentioned phrase was uttered, when it was stopped for once and altogether, without referring to the copy of the defence for an examination of the bearing of the phrase by the context, or even to see how it was modified by the conclusion of the sentence. In consequence of this false statement, Petitioner's Counsel was disconcerted in his argument, having no allusion to any such circumstance on his brief, because no such circumstance had occurred at the time of trial, in support of which assertion your Petitioner can bring forward the most respectable and most efficient evidence, and in contradiction of the statement of the Judge, which she should have done by affidavit before receiving the judgment of the Court, if she had been allowed time, and if she had not been hurried to Prison within two days of her Counsel's motion for a new trial.

That the sentence of the Court upon her after this unjust proceeding was a year's imprisonment in Dorchester Gaol, a fine of five hundred pounds, and securities for seven years to the amount of twelve hundred pounds: whereas, your Petitioner was merely a servant to her brother, and at no period of her life was she ever worth ten pounds; by reason of which fine she has no prospect whatever of being able to comply with the sentence from her own means, and without a remission of the fine, or public charity, she must be imprisoned for life. Such a sentence she submits to your Honourable House is a violation of the law as laid down in the Declaration of Rights, which says, that excessive fines shall not be imposed.

She further submits to your Honourable House, that the denial to her of the right to make a defence, a right never before disputed out of the Star Chamber, is a gross violation of the law and custom of this country committed by the said Sir William Draper Best, and countenanced by the other Judges of that Court; for which she prays the interference of your Honourable House, as the highest tribunal, to a full examination of the matter alleged in this Petition.

And sheweth, as a matter of elucidation of the severity and injustice of Petitioner's case, that the phrase of the Common Law being in many instances an abuse, is fully borne out by a reference to the Journals of your Honourable House, in which it will be found, that your Honourable House has lately interposed statute laws to repeal the laws relating to what has been called Witchcraft, and the Wager of Battle, as the last relic of the mode of trial by ordeal, such laws having been founded upon erroneous opinions, superstitions, and prejudices, which, from an improved state of knowledge, have fallen into desuetude, or have been considered particularly obnoxious and requiring abolition or correction. Your Petitioner therefore submits to your Honourable House, that it was not sufficient ground for the Judge to have stopped her defence from the use of such a phrase, particularly when it was held forth that the continuation of the defence would have explained and have convinced the Jury of the correctness of the assertion. She submits also, that the Jury ought to have been the Judges of her defence, and they were not allowed to hear it by the undue interference of the Judge.

Your Petitioner further submits, that there is another part of her case worthy of the most serious consideration of your Honourable House. Upon what is called the Common Law your Petitioner was indicted for an alleged blasphemous libel, the selection from the pamphlet setting forth that there was no connection between the books of the Old and the New Testaments; for which assertion, in the very selection alleged to be a libel, the authority of the late Archbishop Tillotson is brought forward, and an inference is drawn that the passages called prophecies in the books comprising the Old Testament are not in reality prophecies of the person of Jesus Christ, as mentioned in the books of the New Testament, by which the divinity of the Great Reformer of the Jews is disputed. Now, an act of your Honourable House, passed in the 53d of George the Third, entitled "An Act to relieve those Persons who impugn the

Doctrine of the Holy Trinity," which enactment implies the encouragement and legality of disputing the divinity of Jesus in the legality of impugning the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; nay, so wide a range does this legality to impugn the doctrine of the Holy Trinity take, that the persons who come under the denomination of Atheists may claim a legal right to impugn every principle of Theism under its sanction, by saying, that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is the doctrine of the Christian Deity, and an Act of the British Legislature, passed so late as the year 1813, has expressly and literally made it lawful to impugn that Deity, in direct contradiction of the principle, that Christianity is part and parcel of the law of the land and of the pretended Common Law which is still kept in practice; and in consequence of the provisions of this Act of your Honourable House, the sect denominated Unitarians, for whose relief it was avowedly passed, professing to worship one God only, in unity and not in trinity, who have now chapels or places for worship and lecturing erected in almost every town in the country, are continually describing the sacred person of Jesus Christ, whom Christians worship as a branch of their Deity, as the Peasant of Judea and the Carpenter's Wife's Son, thereby stating that they believe him to have been a mere man; in which they are not only tolerated, but feel themselves secured by an express law, as above-mentioned.

Your Petitioner therefore humbly prays, that your Honourable House will obtain for her that justice which has been denied her in the Court of King's Bench, rescue her from the unjust judgment under which she is now suffering and the penalties imposed on her; and further, that your Honourable House will in its wisdom think fit to render the laws more decisive and intelligible on this head, as the late pretended proceeding by Common Law against your Petitioner has been in evident contradiction to the statute law above-mentioned.

And, as in duty bound,

Your Petitioner will ever pray,

MARY ANN CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, Feb. 28, 1822.

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, Feb. 28, 1822.

I TAKE the liberty to entrust to your care, for presentation to the Honourable the House of Commons, the Petition of

my sister, Mary Ann Carlile; as the distinguished manner in which you before noticed the conduct of Mr. Justice Best, in the case of Mr. Davison, and the pledge you gave to the Honourable House to bring before it any and every similar abuse of the kind that should again occur, has rendered it a duty on my part to ask the favour of your presentation and support of this petition.

I or my sister will be ready, at a moment's notice, to give explanation and information on any and every point mentioned in the Petition, and for the accuracy of every point I undertake to vouch.

Should you, Sir, wish to examine the printed copy of the Suppressed Defence, or the Pamphlet indicted, or a Newspaper report of the proceedings in the Court of King's Bench on moving for a new trial, they shall be forwarded to your appointment.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
RICHARD CARLILE.

John Cam Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
6, Clarges Street, London.

TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR, 6, Albany Court, London.
I HAVE received your letter, and also your Sister's Petition. With respect to the latter, I am sure it would come with greater weight from any other Member of the House of Commons than from myself. At the same time, I cannot but state my opinion, that no object whatever would be gained by the presentation of the Petition by any one. I shall keep the paper until you send for it.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
JOHN C. HOBHOUSE.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol; March 9, 1822.
YOUR declining to present my Sister's Petition to the House of Commons places me in a very delicate position in regard to asking that favour (I should say *right*) from any other Member. There is no one statement in that Petition but my Sister can bring forward respectable persons to verify.

I understand the duty of an honest Member of Parliament to be, *not to refuse to lay before the House of Commons the grievance of any individual, however humble or whatever be its nature, where redress cannot be obtained in the ordinary Courts of Law.* This is my Sister's case. In this character she has applied to you as a Member who has made a great deal of profession upon the very subject of which she complains, and who stands pledged to the House to bring before it, with a "*substantial motion*," any arbitrary acts of the Judges that should follow Mr. Davison's case.

The object to be gained by presenting that Petition to the House of Commons is of the same description as all other objects where complaints are made of certain laws, or of the administration of law: but I had never entertained an idea that the prayer of the Petition would be listened to by a majority of the House of Commons, for a moment, yet much useful discussion may be raised upon the subject if there be a Member to be found bold and honest enough to present it in a becoming manner. This is the aim and end of all such Petitions. You have never seen a Petition presented to the House of Commons, complaining of the conduct of any of the Members of the present Government, the prayer of which has been attended to, or its professed object gained: therefore I am astonished at such an excuse from the Member for Westminster, whose constituents are constantly presenting such Petitions through their Members.

Pursuant to your request, I shall cause a person to call at your house for the paper some day next week, but should it be more agreeable to you to be rid of it by putting it under cover and sending it through the Post, or by servant if left with * * * * *, it will answer every purpose of mine.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

R. CARLILE.

We do not think it necessary to make the least comment on this correspondence. Those who have marked the many unperformed, big promises of Mr. Hobhouse, both in the House and out of the House, will perhaps recollect that his father was once as great a promiser, as little a performer, and bought by Pitt's party for a mere trifle; and that if the circumstances were in existence, it is more than probable that it would be like father like son throughout.

EDITOR.

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE LONDON ZETETIC SOCIETY.

I. THAT no person shall be admitted a member without being first proposed at one of its meetings, and approved by a majority of the members present.

II. That every member subscribe, on admission, the sum of one shilling, and one shilling monthly, such subscription to be applied to defray the expences attending the proceedings; the overplus, if any, to be given towards the purchase of a library, &c.

III. That every member shall have the right of introducing one friend, besides ladies, provided the same person be not introduced as a visitor more than three times within one year. Visitors to have equally the right of speaking: the Chairman having the power to stop any one who occupies more than fifteen minutes.

IV. That any member may be expelled by a majority consisting of no less than two-thirds of the members present at any meeting, if confirmed by two-thirds of the members present at the following meeting. A week's notice of the motion for such expulsion shall be given to the society, and to the member proposed to be expelled.

V. A Treasurer and Secretary shall be appointed to receive the subscriptions, make disbursements, and record the proceedings of the society.

VI. The business of the Society shall be conducted as follows: a meeting shall be held in a place which will be made known to persons on becoming members, every Sunday evening, until a convenient and public place can be taken and announced, the business to commence by each member, in his turn, delivering a lecture, or reading a paper on any topic connected with Theological Controversy, Arts, Science, or History, selected by himself, and afterwards discussed by the meeting. The person furnishing a subject one evening, to act as president on the following evening, or in case of his absence a president to be chosen by the majority.

Persons wishing to become members of this society, are requested to leave their name and address either at No. 5,

Water Lane, Fleet Street; R. Helder's, 10, Duke Street, West Smithfield; or Mr. Griffin's, 11, Middle Row, Holborn.

The above Society has commenced purchasing a library, and has had a few meetings; and will, as early as possible, make itself public, or as soon as a proper place of meeting can be procured and established. Free discussion on all subjects, with philosophical pursuits, will form its ground work.

EDITOR.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

As you have before admitted some of my rhymes into the pages of the Republican I have taken the liberty of sending you a few more. If the foregoing feeble squib, in the absence of a more powerful cracker, meets with your approval, its admission into your line of battle against Corruption's host, will oblige,

Sir, yours respectfully,

W. R.

THE PATRIOTS.

DULL Silence reign'd upon the banks of Thames,
And, in the arms of Morpheus, virtuous dames
Beside their faithful bridegrooms found repose;
While o'er their heads unnumber'd stars arose
To swell the gorgeous retinue of Night,
And give to wakeful lovers genial light.
Augusta's guardians waited for the sound
That should command them on their hourly round;
The tides, obedient to their queen alone,
In "undebauched loyalty" roll'd on;
While brightly she illumin'd St. Paul's clock,
And shed her radiance over—Puddledock;
Perchance, that night beneath its waters lay
A vampire, waiting the reviving ray
Of gentle Cynthia—anon it came,
Reanimating all his torpid frame.
St. Paul's strikes twelve—the sonorous sound he hears,
And from his bed of mud congenial rears
His watery head—its venerable locks
Drip in nice unison with distant clocks,

Which now with various intonated chime,
Proclaim afar the reign of Night sublime,
From Blackfriar's-bridge unearthly voices cry,
Come forth! in Puddledock no longer lie!
Murray come forth! to life and fame awake,
Or sleep for ever in your murky lake.
From arch to arch the echoing summons flies,
Which to obey *instant* Murray hies;
To Puddledock he bids a long adieu;
Changed from a vampire to a patriot true,
He ardent woos Britannia to his arms,
To shield from violence her sacred charms.

An *honest* lawyer having lived before,
He seeks instinctively his office door;
On future fame in meditation sweet,
He paces patiently each lonely street;
At home arrived, with anxious thought oppress'd
On his connubial couch he sinks to rest,
Till through his window Sol's bright beams appear
To light him on his glorious career.

O for some poet's fire whose deathless name
Adorns the golden pinnacle of fame!
O for those beams which great Apollo sheds
On his aspiring votaries' favour'd heads!
Then should my muse right worthily rehearse
The Patriot's praises in immortal verse.
Old Thames, exult, for near your classic flood
Old Murray labours for his country's good;
Murray, who loves his king and would embrace
With joy ten thousand pictures of his face.
Yes!—leader of the patriotic throng—
Old Murray * claims the tribute of my song;
O for the lyre of Pindar to proclaim!
In loftiest lays of melody his name;
To rescue him from Hone's vile insolence,
And from the gaudy 'scutcheon of pretence
Redeem his limbs, that form the noble arms
Of his compeers in glory—wars' alarms
Against the impious and seditious, he
Proclaims aloud, from love of lucre free.
Slander avaunt! thou vile, malicious elf!
Nor dare to whisper, "Murray loves himself"—
Sings not our poet, Pope, that son of Fame
Sweetly, self-love and social are the same?
Besides, 'tis fitting, by the gods! I swear,
That he who makes the church his constant care,
Who both the altar and the throne sustains,
Should reap the golden harvest of his pains.
Then march on Murray—Glory's path pursue;
Glory and gains are one, why make them two?

* The appellation *old* is not used disrespectfully, for age is honourable; it is merely intended to distinguish our hero from all the *young* Murrays, lest they should shine in borrowed splendour.

But, Muse, in humbly praising Britain's friend,
 The "leg improper, proper, and leg-bend"
 Are not thy theme—nor doth the goodly frame
 Which they so well support thy numbers claim;
 What though in Murray's "human face divine"
 The comeliest attributes of manhood shine,
 And in it tuneful Hayley* might have seen
 Triumphant temper amiably serene,
 Of these the wisest judges are the fair,
 Who mark each manly grace with special care;
 Some love-sick poetess whose tender heart
 Has felt the point of wanton Cupid's dart,
 Shot from dear Murray's amorous winning look,
 May on her loved Adonis write a book
 Of melting sonnets, fraught with burning sighs,
 And say—"for love of Murray Flora dies."

Another theme is mine, his God-like mind,
 Bent restless on the good of human kind!
 In vain our noble senate-houses stand,
 Their inmates cannot save our sinking land;
 Murray must seize and guide the helm instead,
 And lo! the patriot's temple rears its head,
 Within the sound of Paul's portentous clock,
 And near his recent dwelling—Puddledock.
 Let no sarcastic rebel scorn the place,
 In mud or muddy brains there's no disgrace,
 Ev'n though that coarse commodity were found
 In Murray's head with such bright genius crown'd.

Brave Britons be no more cajoled by words,
 Mere words, in House of Commons or of Lords,
 But bless kind providence for having sent,
 In time of need, great Sewell's Parliament;
 In *time of need* it came, by Heaven's behest;
 As Murray and dear Budworth can attest.
 No Manners Sutton here shall e'er preside,
 Nor doubting Eldon be the senates guide,
 Let him go crying, doubting, to his grave,
 For Byron's "Cain" has *mark'd* him fool or kn—e;
 Still on the Woolsack he may shed a tear,
 For Murray only shall be Mentor here;
 Save when in fits of condescending grace
 He kindly yields to good Sir John the place.

And hark! for hearts congenial to his own
 He calls to rally round great George's throne;
 Anon they come obedient to his call,
 With ducal caps and mitres crown'd withal;
 Peers and their dames forget their wonted pride,
 And stand with humble plebians side by side;
 No more their noble pedigrees they trace
 To conquering William, but with christian grace
 Nature's true genealogy receive,
 And father Adam own and mother Eve.

* Author of "Triumphs of Temper," a Poem.

All trace their origin to those glad hours
 When our enamoured sire, in Eden's bowers,
 (As Milton sings) woo'd beauteous Eve to wed,
 And press'd with her the roseate nuptial bed.
 Perchance, some fair ones with their beauties try
 To tempt the touch or catch the admiring eye,
 Some duke, or lord, in whispers talks of love,
 But graver patriots their peers reprove;
 "Silence your Grace"—"hush, ladies, not a word
 Great Murray speaks and Murray must be heard."
 "A pin-drop silence" now pervades the scene,
 (Save when clandestine wooings intervene)
 And thus with ardour that all hearts enflames,
 The noble-minded orator exclaims:—
 "All hail! ye high-born pillars of the state,
 We meet for Britain's welfare to debate,
 The tottering altar and the throne to save
 From sinking prematurely to their grave.
 Most noble peers! the swinish multitude
 Must by our speedy union be subdued,
 Or by great Lucifer! (bright son of morn!)
 Your titles, lands, and sinecures are gone,
 For that arch-devil knowledge walks abroad,
 Prohibiting all homage but to God.
 The ducal bonnet and the mitre now
 Command no suppliant reverential bow.
 Nay, men beneath the regal rod repine,
 And dare deny a monarch's right divine;
 No longer with true vassal-grace they bend,
 But for their rights audaciously contend.
 No potent logic can convince the slaves
 Of error, or repel sedition's waves
 From the prerogative of kingly sway,
 Though holy bishops exorcise and pray,
 While saucy politicians wield the pen
 To advocate the rights of common men.
 Shall they dictate to prince, or duke, or lord?
 Great Captain of the Age unsheathe thy sword!
 Yet stay awhile, your Grace, we Christians must
 Learn to be merciful as well as just;
 We will awhile with their perverseness strive,
 We will not kill but bury them alive.
 Immured, enchain'd, on bread and water fed,
 The demagogues will in effect be dead.
 Your purse-strings draw, the glorious libel laws
 Will well defend, my friends, our falling cause.
 And first to save the populace from Hell
 (Which plea methinks all others must excell)
 I'll sally forth—dear Budworth in my rear—
 With love of country full, but free from fear—
 And rase that dreadful pestilential pile,
 The boasted temple of the fiend Carlile!
 For though elsewhere seditious vipers hiss,
 Their venom's harmless, Sir, compared to this

Corroding poison, this profane Address
Against all royalty and blessedness,
Which in my hand I bear, and fain would read,
But, that methinks 'twould be a damning deed
To pour such blasphemies around me here
As on this black infernal page appear."

Great Murray ended, and in all their ears
"So charming leaves his voice" that he appears
Still speaking till as from a thunder-cloud
Th' applause burst forth in peals both long and loud.—
A sound more sweet than from the wild-harp flows
Greets Murray's ear, sweet voices now propose
That they from overflowing coffers bring
Bright tributes forth to their loved church and king!
Soon belles and beaus, young, old, deformed and fair,
With pious zeal their shining offerings bear
To loyalty's proud shrine, and fondly hope
Victoriously with Jacobins to cope;
The blooming maids, though they for bridegrooms sigh,
Vow they'll ne'er wed them, though they maidens die;
The buxom widows, in their weeds protest,
Though Hymen's antique fashion suits them best,
They never will his sacred torch profane
By being bound in an unholy chain.
The wrinkled virgins tremulously say,—
(While false black ringlets hide the genuine grey)
They'll frown on every swain who dares to woo
Unless he proves a loyal man and true.
Thus far the fair—the swains the strain prolong,
And Wellington leads on the bounteous throng,
Gives all that's left by dice, and w——s, and wine,
A willing offering at Religion's shrine!
And doubtless here the noble duke design'd
To read a "moral lesson" to mankind!
Dear Budworth smiles at Murray, knowing well
That treasure given to save poor souls from hell
Will purchase something like a heaven for them,
Whate'er befalls the "spotless diadem."

But thou resplendent sun of Waterloo!
Brave votary of Mars and Venus too,
How shall I sing of thee, whom all the fair
The *ablest* Captain of the Age declare;
Whose prowess nymphs and swains alike approve
And hail thee *non-pareil* in war and love?
Though the bold Louis rules his native land,
And Spaniards own beloved Ferdinand,
But how unlike that pious prince art thou,
No saintly wreath shall deck thy rakish brow;
His royal fingers wrought one Virgin's vest,
While thine, perhaps, unveiled another's breast,
To prove that beauty needs not care nor cost
But "is when unadorn'd adorn'd the most."
Had beauty's queen assailed thee with her charms
And woo'd thee to the Heaven of her arms,

As once, 'tis said, she young Adonis press'd,
But press'd in vain, to be supremely bless'd,
Like him, thou wouldst not churlishly have flown
From the allurements of her unveil'd zone.—

But cease, my muse, the province to invade
Of many a beauteous captivated maid
Whom gratitude might tenderly inspire
In her loved hero's praise to sweep the lyre,
Some lady in the list of those fair friends
To whom thy pure Platonic love extends
Who entertains thee at the festive board
Or ought beside of her dear *absent* lord.

Ye other numerous worthies who belong
To this transcendent patriotic throng
Your righteous meed of praise you must excuse;
My unpoetical and fireless muse
Cannot proceed—her Pegasus is tired!
Some poet with true inspiration fired
Shall sing your praise in strains that shall survive
As long as despots reign and serviles live.
Nought but accursed Freedom's wild-fire light
Shall ever eclipse your page of glory bright,
Nay, even then shall live each honour'd name
“Damn'd,” through each age “to everlasting fame.”

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

MANY enquiries have been made when the publication of the Second and following Days' Proceedings on the Mock Trials of Mr. Carlile will commence. To this it is answered, that no opportunity will be lost for completing the publication, but it may be two or three months before any thing further of it will be printed. The demand for the First Day's Proceedings equals for the present our means of keeping them in print, and we wish to see something of the extent of the demand before the Second Day is proceeded with. The moment we begin with the Second Day, the whole will be very soon finished, of which due notice will be given, and the publication will go on at Twopence per Sheet, as it commenced. All Subscribers are advised to complete their First Day's Proceedings as early as possible, as “The Age of Reason” being perfect in it, at the small price of Half-a-Crown, a demand is calculated upon, that will require our utmost exertions for some months to supply.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street. All Communications (post paid) are requested to be sent to Dorchester Gaol, until a further Address to some House or Shop be given.—Orders, with remittances, or references for payment, will be punctually attended to. Country Agents will find the most liberal Terms for prompt Payment.